

Interpretation of Table:
JAIL POPULATIONS: 1st Quarter '05 versus 1st Quarter '06

This table:

- summarizes the ADP results for the 61 jurisdictions in California reporting data from Type II, III, and IV jails;
- summarizes jurisdiction ADP results for the most recent quarter (Column C);
- compares jurisdiction ADP for the most recent quarter with the same quarter last year (Column B);
- ranks the jurisdictions in terms of gains or losses in ADP from high to low (Column D);
- lists the percentage growth or decline in ADP for each jurisdiction (Column E);
- lists the percentage of the overall State increase or decrease in ADP that is represented by each jurisdiction (Column F);
- lists, by jurisdiction, the cumulative percentage increase and decrease in the State ADP starting with the jurisdiction with the highest percentage of the increase and proceeding to the jurisdiction with the highest percentage of the decrease (Column G);
- lists, by jurisdiction, the cumulative total increase and decrease in the State ADP starting with the jurisdiction with the highest increase and proceeding to the jurisdiction with the biggest decrease (Column H); and,
- lists the jurisdictions that experienced decreases in their ADP as shaded.

Some important conclusions from this table are:

1. The two numbers at the bottom indicate the "total increase" in ADP (in this case 3,159) and "total decrease" in ADP (-360). In other words, the jurisdictions experiencing increases had a total increase of 3,159 ADP; and the jurisdictions experiencing decreases had a total decrease of 360 ADP. Subtracting 360 from 3,159 produces the overall increase of 2,799 between the first quarter of 2005 and the first quarter of 2006.
2. The Los Angeles County ADP increase of 859 is 27.2% of the total increase of 3,159. Forty-one jurisdictions had increases (down to Calaveras Sheriff's Department) with 2 jurisdictions reporting no increases (Yuba Sheriff's Department and Mono Sheriff's Department). When you get to Mono Sheriff's Department, you have accounted for 100% of the increases (100% of the cumulative total of 3,159).
3. Jurisdictions that experienced a decrease in ADP are listed from smallest decrease to largest decrease (Amador Sheriff's Department to Oakland Police Department). When you get to the bottom of the table, you have accounted for 100% of the total decreases of 360 inmates.
4. The cumulative percentage of ADP increase for the top four jurisdictions (Los Angeles Sheriff's Department to San Bernardino Sheriff's Departments) is 56.3%. In other words, four jurisdictions accounted for over 56% of the total ADP increase. Three jurisdictions (Alameda Sheriff's Department, Imperial Sheriff's Department, and Oakland Police Department) account for about 55.0% of the decreases. Please note that Oakland Police Department will no longer be reporting on the Jail Profile Survey due to the closure of its jail, which accounts for approximately 28.6% of the total decrease.